REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1-12 and 15, and have canceled claims 2-8, 10, and 12-24, during prosecution of this patent application. Applicants are not conceding in this patent application that said amended and canceled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue said amended and canceled claims, and other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Claims 9 and 11 have been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim 1 and all of the limitations of all other claims from which claims 9 and 11 depend. Accordingly, claims 9 and 11 are substantively the same claims as existed before being so rewritten in independent form.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Patterson (US Patent No.: 6,389,541 B1) in view of Bell et al. (US Pub. No.: 2003/0130952).

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Patterson (US Patent No.: 6,389,541 B1) in view of Bell et al. (US Pub. No.: 2003/0130952).

Since claims 2-8, 10, and 12-24 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 2-8, 10, and 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot.

Only claims 1, 9, and 11 are currently pending.

Claim 1

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

As a first example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "identifying the selected item by correlating the determined position of the pressed point with a position of the selected item in a list of item positions recorded in an item position column of an edited objects table that is stored in the user workstation, said list of item positions being associated with the plurality of items on the page of the physical document".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, abstract, col. 4, lines 1-12, col. 7, lines 17-47 discloses the preceding feature of claim 1.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, abstract, col. 4, lines 1-12,

col. 7, lines 17-47 does not mention anything about "a position of the selected item in a list of item positions recorded in an item position column of an edited objects table that is stored in the user workstation", and does not mention anything about "said list of item positions being associated with the plurality of items on the page of the physical document", and does not mention anything about said "correlating ...".

In further response, Applicants respectfully contend that the only table-like entity disclosed in Patterson, abstract, col. 4, lines 1-12, col. 7, lines 17-47 is a data file comprising digital content such as text, video, music, multimedia documents with text,(e.g., see Patterson, abstract, line 1 and col. 7, lines 26-27). Paterson does not anywhere disclose that the data file has "a position of the selected item in a list of item positions recorded in an item position column". Patterson does not even disclose that the data file comprise a column of information of any kind.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a second example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the edited objects table comprises a header section ..., wherein the header section comprises a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) of the edited objects server, a publication number of the physical document, a title of the physical document, an author of the physical document, a date of publication of the physical document, and an International Standard Book Number (ISBN) of the physical document".

The preceding feature of claim 1 is a newly added feature which the Examiner has not yet considered and which is not disclosed by Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not disclose that a header section of the edited objects table comprises a URL of the

edited objects server, a publication number, a title, an author, a date of publication, and an ISBN of the physical document .

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a third example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the edited objects table comprises ... a body section, ... wherein the body section comprises a plurality of rows and three columns".

The preceding feature of claim 1 is a newly added feature which the Examiner has not yet considered and which is not disclosed by Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not disclose a body section comprises a plurality of rows and three columns.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a fourth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein each row of the plurality of rows is specific to a copyrighted edited object".

The preceding feature of claim 1 is a newly added feature which the Examiner has not yet considered and which is not disclosed by Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not disclose that a row in the edited objects table is specific to a copyrighted edited object. Patterson in view of Bell does not even disclose the existence of a row of any kind for any purpose in the edited objects table.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a fifth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the three columns consist of the item position column comprising a position of the edited object on the page, an item name column comprising a name of the edited object, and an edited object path column comprising either a file path to the edited object on the user workstation which denotes that the user has a license to use and/or copy the edited object or informing text indicating that the edited object does not exist on the user workstation which denotes that the user does not have the license to use and/or copy the edited object".

The preceding feature of claim 1 is a newly added feature which the Examiner has not yet considered and which is not disclosed by Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not disclose the existence of preceding three recited columns in the edited objects table.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a sixth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the edited object path column for at least one row of the plurality of rows comprises the file path to the edited object specific to each row of the at least one row, and wherein the edited object path column for each row of at least one other row of the plurality of rows comprises the informing text".

The preceding feature of claim 1 is a newly added feature which the Examiner has not yet considered and which is not disclosed by Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not disclose that the edited object path column comprises both the file path to the

edited object (in at least one row) the informing text (in at least one other row).

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a seventh example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "identifying an edited object in the edited objects table from an edited object name denoted in the item name column in a determined row of the edited objects table in which there is an association of the edited object with the selected item resulting from said correlating".

The preceding feature of claim 1 is a newly added feature which the Examiner has not yet considered and which is not disclosed by Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not disclose that an edited object name denoted in the item name column in a determined row of the edited objects table identifies the edited object.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a eighth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "ascertaining, from the informing text in the edited object path column of the determined row, that the user does not have a license to use and/or copy the first edited object".

The preceding feature of claim 1 is a newly added feature which the Examiner has not yet considered and which is not disclosed by Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not disclose that informing text in the edited object path column of the determined row in the edited objects table indicates that the user does not have a license to use and/or copy the

first edited object.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a ninth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "after said ascertaining, sending, from the user workstation to the edited objects server, a request for information concerning the first edited object, wherein the request comprises an identification of the physical document, an identification of the page, and an identification of the selected item".

Patterson in view of Bell does not teach sending the recited request for information (comprising an identification of the physical document, an identification of the page, and an identification of the selected item) from the user workstation to the edited objects server.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a tenth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "receiving, by the user workstation from the edited objects server, the requested information, wherein the received requested information comprises license terms and conditions as well as pricing and ordering information pertaining to the first edited object".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 as allegedly disclosing the preceding feature of claim 1.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not disclose requesting any information concerning the edited object, and that Patterson, col. 4, lines

13-28 does not disclose receiving any requested information concerning the edited object, and that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not most certainly does not disclose requesting information comprising "license terms and conditions as well as pricing and ordering information pertaining to the first edited object".

Applicants note that the Examiner does not even allege that Patterson discloses that the received requested information comprises "license terms and conditions".

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

Patterson in view of Bell does not teach receiving the requested information (comprising license terms and conditions as well as pricing and ordering information pertaining to the first edited object) by the user workstation from the edited objects server.

For example, the Examiner refers to Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 in which Patterson discloses that the object may be licensed to the user. However, Patterson does not disclose that the user workstation receives licensing information from the edited objects server.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a eleventh example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "after said receiving the requested information, displaying the received requested information on the user workstation".

The Examiner (with respect to claim 9) argues that the abstract in Patterson discloses "displaying the received requested information".

In response, Applicants assert that the abstract in Patterson does not disclose "displaying

the received requested information" and most certainly not disclose "displaying the received requested information on the user workstation".

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a twelfth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "after said displaying or playing the received requested information, sending an order from the user workstation to the edited objects server for the license, wherein the order comprises the identification of the physical document, the page, the selected item, and payment data relating to the selected item and required by a publisher of the physical document".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 for the claimed "sending an order". However, Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses that the order may comprise payment information, use information, employment-related data, educational information, family information, but does not disclose that the order may include the page and both the selected item and an identification of the physical document.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a thirteenth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "after said sending the order, receiving, by the user workstation from the edited objects server, the edited object with the license".

The Examiner argues that Pattern, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses receiving the edited object

with the license from the edited objects server.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not disclose that the user workstation receives the edited object **with the license** from the edited objects server.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a fourteenth example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "updating the edited object path column in the edited objects table in the user workstation with a file path for accessing the stored received first edited object".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47.

In response, Applicants contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 discloses that digital content is downloaded to the client computer, but does not disclose that the edited object path column in the edited objects table is updated in the user workstation with a file path for accessing the stored received first edited object.

Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, and that claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 9

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of

Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 9.

As a first example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "identifying the selected item by correlating the determined position of the pressed point with a position of the selected item in a list of item positions recorded in an item position column of an edited objects table that is stored in the user workstation, said list of item positions being associated with the plurality of items on the page of the physical document".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, abstract, col. 4, lines 1-12, col. 7, lines 17-47 disclose the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, abstract, col. 4, lines 1-12, col. 7, lines 17-47 does not mention anything about "a position of the selected item in a list of item positions recorded in an item position column of an edited objects table that is stored in the user workstation", and does not mention anything about "said list of item positions being associated with the plurality of items on the page of the physical document", and does not mention anything about said "correlating ...".

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a second example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "identifying an edited object in the edited objects table from association of the edited object with the selected item in the edited

objects".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 disclose the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 7, lines 29-31 discloses identifying an HTML file by a URL pinpointing the file's location. However, Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 does not mention anything about an "association of the edited object with the selected item in the edited objects" being used for "identifying an edited object in the edited objects table".

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a third example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "ascertaining whether the user has a license to use and/or copy the edited object".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses that the object may be licensed to the user (see Patterson, col. 4, line 21). However, Patterson does not anywhere disclose performing the test of "ascertaining whether the user has a license to use and/or copy the edited object".

More specifically, Patterson, col. 10, lines 30-31 discloses ascertaining whether the transaction has been accepted or rejected, but does not disclose that whether the transaction has been accepted or rejected relates to whether or not the user has a license to use and/or copy the

edited object.

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a fourth example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "if said ascertaining ascertains that the user does not have the license then obtaining the license and the edited object from an edited objects server, wherein said ascertaining ascertains that the user does not have the license".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, col. 10, lines 49-67 and disclose the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 10, lines 49-67 does not disclose anything relating to whether the user has or does not have the license. Applicants note that Patterson, col. 10, lines 33-33 disclose that if the transaction has been rejected, then a rejection message is sent to the user. However Patterson does not disclose that the license and the edited object are obtained from the edited objects server if the user does not have the license (or even if the transaction has been rejected).

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a fifth example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "sending an order for the license to an edited objects server".

The Examiner does not even allege that Patterson in view of Bell discloses the preceding feature of claim 9.

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a sixth example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "receiving the edited object with the license from the edited objects server".

The Examiner argues that Pattern, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses receiving the edited object with the license from the edited objects server.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not disclose that the edited object is received **with the license** from the edited objects server.

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a seventh example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "updating the edited objects table with a file path for accessing the stored edited object".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 as allegedly disclosing the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 discloses that digital content is downloaded to the client computer, but does not disclose that the edited object path column in the edited objects table is updated with a file path for accessing the stored received first edited object.

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a eighth example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "indicating in the edited objects table that the user has the license".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 as allegedly disclosing the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses that the object may be licensed to the user (see Patterson, col. 4, line 21). However, Patterson does not anywhere disclose "indicating in the edited objects table that the user has the license".

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a ninth example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein said sending the order for the license to the edited objects server comprises sending to the edited objects server a request for information concerning the edited object".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 as allegedly disclosing the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not disclose "sending to the edited objects server a request for information concerning the edited object". In fact, Patterson does not anywhere disclose "sending to the edited objects server a request for information concerning the edited object". Applicants cannot find, anywhere in Patterson, sending a request for information to the edited objects server.

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a tenth example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "receiving the requested information from the edited objects server".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 as allegedly disclosing the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not disclose "receiving the requested information from the edited objects server". As explained supra, Patterson does not disclose "sending to the edited objects server a request for information concerning the edited object" and likewise does not disclose "receiving the requested information from the edited objects server"

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As an eleventh example of why claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the requested information comprises: license terms and conditions; pricing and ordering information; and an identification of the physical document, the page, and the selected item".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 as allegedly disclosing the preceding feature of claim 9.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not disclose requesting any information concerning the edited object, and that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not disclose receiving any requested information concerning the edited object, and that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not most certainly does not disclose requesting information

comprising "license terms and conditions; pricing and ordering information; and an identification of the physical document, the page, and the selected item".

Applicants note that the Examiner does not even allege that Patterson discloses that the received requested information comprises "license terms and conditions".

Therefore, claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 9 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, and that claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 11

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, because Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 11.

As a first example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "identifying the selected item by correlating the determined position of the pressed point with a position of the selected item in a list of item positions recorded in an item position column of an edited objects table that is stored in the user workstation, said list of item positions being associated with the plurality of items on the page of the physical document".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, abstract, col. 4, lines 1-12, col. 7, lines 17-47 disclose the preceding feature of claim 11.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, abstract, col. 4, lines 1-12, col. 7, lines 17-47 does not mention anything about "a position of the selected item in a list of item positions recorded in an item position column of an edited objects table that is stored in the user workstation", and does not mention anything about "said list of item positions being associated with the plurality of items on the page of the physical document", and does not mention anything about said "correlating ...".

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a second example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "identifying an edited object in the edited objects table from association of the edited object with the selected item in the edited objects".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 disclose the preceding feature of claim 11.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 7, lines 29-31 discloses identifying an HTML file by a URL pinpointing the file's location. However, Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 does not mention anything about an "association of the edited object with the selected item in the edited objects" being used for "identifying an edited object in the edited objects table".

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a third example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell,

Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "ascertaining whether the user has a license to use and/or copy the edited object".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses the preceding feature of claim 11.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses that the object may be licensed to the user (see Patterson, col. 4, line 21). However, Patterson does not anywhere disclose performing the test of "ascertaining whether the user has a license to use and/or copy the edited object".

More specifically, Patterson, col. 10, lines 30-31 discloses ascertaining whether the transaction has been accepted or rejected, but does not disclose that whether the transaction has been accepted or rejected relates to whether or not the user has a license to use and/or copy the edited object.

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a fourth example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "if said ascertaining ascertains that the user does not have the license then obtaining the license and the edited object from an edited objects server, wherein said ascertaining ascertains that the user does not have the license".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, col. 10, lines 49-67 and disclose the preceding feature of claim 11.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 10, lines 49-67 does not disclose anything relating to whether the user has or does not have the license. Applicants note

that Patterson, col. 10, lines 33-33 disclose that if the transaction has been rejected, then a rejection message is sent to the user. However Patterson does not disclose that the license and the edited object are obtained from the edited objects server if the user does not have the license (or even if the transaction has been rejected).

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a fifth example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "sending an order for the license to an edited objects server".

The Examiner does not even allege that Patterson in view of Bell discloses the preceding feature of claim 11.

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a sixth example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "receiving the edited object with the license from the edited objects server".

The Examiner argues that Pattern, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses receiving the edited object with the license from the edited objects server.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 does not disclose that the edited object is received **with the license** from the edited objects server.

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a seventh example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "updating the edited objects table with a file path for accessing the stored edited object".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 as allegedly disclosing the preceding feature of claim 11.

In response, Applicants contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 17-47 discloses that digital content is downloaded to the client computer, but does not disclose that the edited object path column in the edited objects table is updated with a file path for accessing the stored received first edited object.

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a eighth example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "indicating in the edited objects table that the user has the license".

The Examiner cites Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 as allegedly disclosing the preceding feature of claim 11.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, col. 4, lines 13-28 discloses that the object may be licensed to the user (see Patterson, col. 4, line 21). However, Patterson does not anywhere disclose "indicating in the edited objects table that the user has the license".

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

As a ninth example of why claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell,

Patterson in view of Bell does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the edited objects table comprises rows and columns, wherein each row is associated with a unique edited object, and wherein the columns comprise a column for item position, a column for item name, and a column for the file path for accessing the edited object".

The Examiner argues that Patterson, abstract discloses the preceding feature of claim 11.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Patterson, abstract absolutely does not disclose anything about the edited objects table comprising rows and columns, and most certainly does not disclose that the edited objects table discloses that "each row is associated with a unique edited object" or that "the columns comprise a column for item position, a column for item name, and a column for the file path for accessing the edited object".

Therefore, claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 11 is not unpatentable over Patterson in view of Bell, and that claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM).

Date: 05/21/2008

Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
Telephone (518) 220-1850
Facsimile (518) 220-1857
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com